DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 060 JC 690 005

By-Kendra, Lawrence M.; Noble, Sidney
Housing and Transportation Study: Full-Time Employees.
Cuyahoga Community Coll., Cleveland, Ohio.
Pub Date Sep 68
Note-40p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.10
Descriptors-*College Housing, *Faculty Recruitment, *Housing Needs, *Junior Colleges, Questionnaires, *Teacher Housing, Transportation
Identifiers-*Ohio

This questionnaire survey shows the many influences on selection of housing and transportation by employees of a Cleveland junior college district (Cuyahoga Community College). It is felt the data would be pertinent to personnel recruitment, housing policies for faculty and staff, private housing developments, dissemination of housing information by the college, assessment of campus parking needs, etc. Administrator response was 74.2%; faculty, 51.9%; and non-academic personnel, 36.1%. Part I, Respondents' Characteristics, covers their job classification, sex, and marital status. Part II, Transportation, shows distances from work, methods of transportation, and average commuting time. Part III, Housing, compares employees' actual housing conditions and degrees of satisfaction with their preferences. It also notes the influence of proximity to church or school, rental charges, and mortgage payments on housing choice. Part IV records the likes and dislikes of the respondents for the Cleveland metropolitan area. All data are shown in tables. (HH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED026080

Cuyahoga Community College

Housing and Transportation Study
Full-Time Employees

Office of Planning and Development

Lawrence M. Kendra
Research Assistant

Sidney Noble
Director of Special Assistance

September 1968
Office of the Executive Vice-President

JC 690 005

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 24 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Introduction

This report is the result of a questionnaire designed to develop a profile relating to transportation and housing of college faculty, administrative and nonacademic personnel.

Data derived from this study have implications bearing upon such matters as recruitment of personnel, developing policies concerning housing for faculty and staff, providing information for private developers of housing and related facilities, establishing a college housing office, providing for parking, etc.

The role transportation may play in planning for future campus sites is highlighted by the large percentage (58.8%) who drive to work. Related to this fact seems to be that the largest number of expressed dislikes for the Cleveland area concern traffic and transportation.

The material is arranged in two sections: a four part narrative and a two division appendix consisting of 22 tables and the questionnaire.

Part I, Respondent's Characteristics, is commentary on the first four tables in appendix I. It deals primarily with the questionnaire response rate, the job classification, sex and marital status of the respondents.

Part II, Transportation, discusses tables 5 through 7 and concerns matters of distances employees live from their work, their methods of transportation and average commuting times.

Part III, Housing, is concerned with tables 8 through 20. Shown are respondent's housing situations and satisfactions balanced against their expressed housing preferences and requirements. Noted also are related factors such as whether the location of churches and schools influenced their choice of residential area and whether they considered

monthly rental or mortgage payments reasonable for their dwelling.

The number of persons occupying the respondents dwelling is discussed and a profile of a typical college employee's household is drawn. Further insights are developed by data concerning how much, typically, is paid monthly for the dwelling and what type of schools the children attend.

Part IV, Opinion of Greater Cleveland Area, concludes with tables 21 and 22 which record explicit positive and negative reactions of the respondents toward the Cleveland area.

PART I

Respondent's Characteristics

The data presented in this section concern the general classification of respondents to the housing and transportation study conducted among Cuyahoga Community College employees. The overall response rate of 49.5 per cent was a sufficient rate from each classification to allow useful analysis and reporting of findings. Table 1 shows these response rates by assignment area.

Three classifications of employees at Cuyahoga Community College - faculty, administrative and nonacademic personnel were used in the survey. Their respective response rates (along with employment figures) are presented in Table 2. Administrators showed the highest rate of response with an overall 74.2 per cent. Faculty (51.9 per cent) and nonacademic personnel (36.1 per cent) ranked second and third respectively. The total response rate, less those not identifying their job classification (a total of eight), amounted to 47.9 per cent.

Four employees in the District Office listed their classification as faculty. These responses seem to be in error since faculty are assigned to campuses only and not to the district. Since the questionnaires were not identifiable by names of respondents, no allocations to campus could be made so these four are shown in Table 2 as faculty in the district.

Table 3 shows six characteristics of the employees who responded to the questionnaire. The designation of sex is highly representative since only eight (3.2 per cent) of the 248 respondents failed to identify their

sex. The sex ratios in all the assignment areas were very close, but females held a slight majority in all cases. Actual employment figures for the college, at the same time, showed females with a slight plurality of approximately 52 per cent to 48 per cent males. Respondents showed an overall plurality of 50.4 per cent in favor of females. This slight difference might be attributable to the no answer respondents.

Marital status, as reported by the respondents, is shown in Table 4. For the purpose of this survey, the classifications of separated, widowed, and divorced were combined into one answer choice - "others." A great many (65.3 per cent) of the responding employees were married. District employees showed the highest ratio with 84.1 per cent of employees married. Eleven or 4.4 per cent of the respondents failed to identify their marital status.

While the numbers are different, the percentage similarities between the campuses are noteworthy. Married persons on both campuses were in the majority with those assigned at Metropolitan showing 60.4 per cent and those at Western showing 62.7 per cent. Single employees were 25.6 per cent of Metropolitan's staff and 22.9 per cent of Western's staff. Those of "other" marital status accounted for 9.9 per cent at Metropolitan and 7.2 per cent at Western.

PART II

Transportation

To secure information regarding the methods of transportation used by employees of the college, along with the distances they live from work and their commuting time, was one of the main reasons this study was undertaken. This section summarizes their responses to these questions.

Table 5 outlines how far the respondents, by assignment area, live from work. Well over 70 per cent of the total respondents lived within 15 miles of their assignments. District employees showed the lowest percentage living within 15 miles (54.5 per cent). This is partially explained since none of them lived within five miles. At Western Campus, however, 53 per cent of the employees lived within five miles as compared with only 13.2 per cent of Metropolitan employees in the same catagory.

Despite the very large number of Western employees living within five miles of their assignments, the largest number (79), and percentage (31.9 per cent) of the respondents lived between six and ten miles from their assignments. This five miles group, however, is the second most numerous.

Table 6 is a summary of the various methods of transportation used by employees of Cuyahoga Community College. In a great many cases respondents indicated that different modes were used on different occasions; that is, a person might usually drive to work but on exceptional occasions use some sort of public transportation. The figures presented list the number of times each means was actually listed as having been used. Less than 4 per cent of the respondents failed to list any method of transportation.

A significant point of interest is the large number of employees who usually drive to work. Contributing substantially to this figure is the

large number of Western Campus persons driving to work (95.3 per cent). A possible explanation for this may be inadequate cross-town bus lines on the West side.

The Rapid Transit is apparently of no use to Western employees since none indicated its use. Even though both Metropolitan and District employees are within easy walking distance of the terminal tower, Rapid use is not great for them. Only 14.4 per cent of Metropolitan and 9.0 per cent of District employees make use of it.

Table 7 is a summary of the average travel times respondents indicated they spend in commuting by means of the various methods of transportation. Again, the figures reported represent each time a mode of transportation was listed and accompained by a time. Multiple answers were received and, therefore, no effort is made to directly relate these to respondents.

Except for Western Campus employees, those traveling by car normally spend between 35 and 40 minutes commuting. Western employees spend slightly more than 20 minutes. Those who commute by bus show a different pattern. Metropolitan and District employees spend between 49 and 54 minutes as compared to 65 minutes for Western employees.

Average travel times for all methods of transportation show Western Campus personnel spend much less time in transit than Metropolitan and District. This, however, can be mostly explained by recognizing that the largest group of Western Campus employees lived within five miles (53.0 per cent) of the campus while the largest group of Metropolitan Campus (40.5 per cent) and District Office (31.8 per cent) employees lived between six and ten miles from work.

PART III

Housing

The second major area of this study has to do with housing and housing preferences of Cuyahoga Community College employees. Data were developed concerning their current dwelling situation and how well it matched their expressed preferences. Satisfaction with their current facilities was next studied. Other related factors (such as whether churches and schools influenced their choice of residence and whether the monthly rental or mortgage payment was reasonable for the dwelling they occupied) are also covered in this section.

Table 8 displays current renting or purchasing status of employees compared with their expressed preferences. As far as current condition and preferred condition are concerned, buying is far-and-away the leader (58.9 per cent of the employees were currently buying and 68.1 per cent preferred to buy). Western Campus employees showed the largest percentages for both catagories. Of more importance might be the fact that a greater percentage of employees preferred to buy than were currently buying. This would indicate that a substantial number of current renters preferred to be buying their homes.

Table 9 compares the types of units occupied by college employees to the type of unit they would prefer to occupy. The most preferred type of dwelling unit (71 per cent) was a single family house. Multiple units, or apartments, showed second with 14.1 per cent and duplexes were third with less than 3 per cent of the total. A relatively large percentage of respondents (12.5 per cent) failed to answer these questions. Total counts showed that 176 respondents lived in single homes while 35 were in multiple units and 6 resided in duplexes. Regardless of the type of unit

resided in, single houses were very popular. Only where multiple units are concerned did the total number of respondents indicate a plurality not in favor of single houses (and this was a slim margin of two respondents in favor of multiple units over single houses). The largest number of persons preferring multiple units are assigned to the Metropolitan Campus and were living in this type of dwelling.

Tables 10 and 11 are summaries of the number of persons living in the respondent's dwelling. Table 10 deals with the number of adults (18 years of age and older) and Table 11 with children (under 18 years of age). The household of the average employee of Cuyahoga Community College shows a profile of two adults and two or less children. Adult residents showed 71.0 per cent lived in dwellings with one or two persons 18 years of age or older. Where children were concerned, employees with none and those with one or two both showed 32.7 per cent (65.4 per cent for the two groups). It should be noted that a number of respondents failed to answer these questions (13.3 per cent where adults are concerned and 16.5 per cent on children).

One of the survey questions concerned a list of things the respondents considered as requirements for adequate living accommodations. The answers are summarized in Table 12. A profile of the preferred residence of a typical Cuyahoga Community College employee would include three bedrooms, a basement, a garage (preferably for two cars), a dining room, a family room, and one-and-one-half baths. Metropolitan, Western, and District employees agreed on this basic requirement for adequate housing.

The respondents were asked if they considered their current dwelling adequate. Their responses are shown in Table 13 under buying and renting. At all three assignment areas (Metropolitan, Western, and District) buyers generally considered their dwellings adequate while renters, by a lesser

margin, felt them to be inadequate. The percentages between the assignment areas differed but the tendencies were in the same direction. On an overall basis (buyers and renters of all three assignment areas combined) there was a slight majority (121 satisfied compared to 119 not satisfied) indicating their dwellings were adequate.

Table 14 lists the mortgage payments carried by Cuyahoga Community College employees. A total of 146 respondents (58.9 per cent of the total responding) were currently buying and all but 17 indicated their monthly mortgage payments. The majority of persons (61.7 per cent) paid between $101 to $200 monthly for mortgage retirement. These payments include interest and taxes. Those paying $100 or less per month amounted to 6.2 per cent and those paying $200 or more per month accounted for 10.9 per cent. Almost 10 per cent indicated their home mortgages were retired.

Renters and their monthly rents are presented in Table 15. A total of 100 respondents, or 40.3 per cent, indicated they currently were paying rent for their living facilities. For the purposes of classification, nine respondents who lived with their parents, but paid no rent were included with no answers which, then, accounted for 15 per cent of the total (actually only 6 per cent failed to indicate a rental fee). The largest group of employees (68 per cent) paid between $76 and $150 per month for rent. While the percentage differed, the grouping remained constant at all three assignment areas. Only 4 per cent paid $75 or less per month and 13 per cent paid $151 or more.

Table 16 presents the services, utilities or items included in the rental charges paid by Cuyahoga Community College employees. The most often listed items included were heat, water, garbage removal, carpeting, and custodial services. Also included in order were clothes washers and driers, and garbage disposals. A total of 27 persons listed none of the

items as included in their rental charges.

In conjunction with the rental charges and lists of inclusives, respondents were asked to react regarding the reasonableness or fairness of their payments. These answers are shown in Table 17. Respondents saying the dwelling was equal to the rental charges amounted to 44 per cent while 30 per cent felt the charges were too high. Those living with parents were again included in the no answer group.

The last group of questions in the housing section concerned what part the churches or schools they might attend had to do with their choice in selecting the location of their residence.

Table 18 summarizes the findings regarding the influence the proximity of places of worship had on selecting the dwelling location. Generally speaking, the church location had little to do with this selection process. The great majority of respondents, renters, and buyers, indicated very little or no influence at all. District and Western buyers showed a greater tendency to list moderate influence, but there was by no means a majority in this tendency. There were a significant number, 8.9 per cent, who said that the place of worship greatly influenced their choice of residence.

Table 19 summarizes the influence the location of schools had on the choice of residences of Cuyahoga Community College employees. In this case, a large number of respondents had to be treated under the heading of "not applicable" since they either had no children, were single or their children were grown and self-supporting. The no answer and "not applicable" groups accounted for 40.3 per cent of the total number of respondents.

Respondents generally indicated that schools played a particularly influencial part in their choice of residential locations. The largest group (37.1 per cent) indicated it influenced greatly and another 14.9 per cent said it influenced moderately. These are striking levels since

slightly over 40 per cent of the respondents either failed to answer or the question was nonapplicable.

Table 20 recapitulates the answers to a question regarding children attending private schools. These answers were, again, separated by buying or renting dwelling units.

The largest group, by far, sent their children to public schools (38.3 per cent) while the majority (52.4 per cent) either did not answer or were in the nonapplicable group. A small minority, only 9.3 per cent of the respondents sent their children to private schools and the great majority of these were currently buying their homes.

It appears, then, that while parents employed at Cuyahoga Community College were highly influenced by where their children went to school, they were basically satisfied with the public education system in the areas where they lived. There was no indicated preference regarding Cleveland proper or any urban location suburb.

PART IV

Opinion of Greater Cleveland Area

As a by-product of the housing and transportation questionnaire, it was deemed desirable to determine what positive and/or negative characteristics the greater Cleveland area held for Cuyahoga Community College employees. These findings will be presented here. No effort was made to correlate the answers to individual or groups of respondents. There were also multiple answers in some cases which cause the totals to disagree with those in other tables.

Positive characteristics are listed in descending order (totals) in Table 21. The most frequently listed answer, by far, was that the area was generally a good place to live. This was followed with three closely ranked answers of educational opportunities, employment opportunities, and closeness to home and family. There were a large number of no answers (slightly more than 27 per cent). Surprisingly, the cultural facilities and the Metropolitan Park System, two things the Cleveland area is well known for are well down the list of positive attributes.

Table 22 presents the factors which Cuyahoga Community College employees dislike about the area. The most often sighted area of discontent was with traffic problems and transportation facilities. This was followed by a tie for second and third place among those who generally disliked the area and those who felt the pollution problem (water and air) was their most prominent dislike. The next was weather, which no one can do anything about.

Of interest is the small number of persons (9) sighting racial trouble as a primary dislike for the city.

The remaining dislikes were basically of the type which might be expressed by residents of most large cities.

APPENDIX I

Tables

TABLE 1

RESPONSE RATES BY ASSIGNMENT AREA

Assignment Area	Questionnaires		Per Cent of Totals Returned
	Distributed	Returned	
Metropolitan	302	121	40.1
Western	138	83	60.1
District	61	44	72.1
Total	501	248	49.5

TABLE 2

JOB CLASSIFICATIONS OF EMPLOYEES AND RESPONDENTS

	Metropolitan			Western			District			Total		
	Employment	Responses	Per Cent	Employment	Responses	Per Cent	Employment	Responses	Per Cent	Employment	Responses	Per Cent
Faculty (full-time)	156	68	43.6	60	40	66.7	--	4	--	216	112	51.9
Administrators	35	21	60.0	17	14	82.4	14	14	100.0	66	49	74.2
Nonacademic Employment	111	28	25.2	61	26	42.6	47	25	53.2	219	79	36.1
Total	302	117	38.7	138	80	58.0	61	43	70.5	501	240	47.9
No Answer	--	4	--	--	3	--	--	1	--	--	8	--
Total	302	121	40.1	138	83	60.1	61	44	72.1	501	248	49.5

TABLE 3

SEX CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

	Metropolitan		Western		District		Total	
	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct
Male	55	45.5	39	47.0	21	47.7	115	46.4
Female	61	50.4	41	49.4	23	52.3	125	50.4
No Answer	5	4.1	3	3.6	--	--	8	3.2
Total	121	100.0	83	100.0	44	100.0	248	100.0

TABLE 4

MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

	Metropolitan		Western		District		Total	
	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct
Married	73	60.4	52	62.7	37	84.1	162	65.3
Single	31	25.6	19	22.9	6	13.6	56	22.6
Other*	12	9.9	6	7.2	1	2.3	19	7.7
No Answer	5	4.1	6	7.2	--	--	11	4.4
Total	121	100.0	83	100.0	44	100.0	248	100.0

*Includes separated, widowed, and divorced

TABLE 5

DISTANCE EMPLOYEES LIVE FROM WORK ASSIGNMENT

Distance	Metropolitan		Western		District		Total	
	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct
1-5 miles	16	13.2	44	53.0	--	--	60	24.2
6-10 miles	49	40.5	16	19.3	14	31.8	79	31.9
11-15 miles	25	20.7	7	8.4	10	22.7	42	16.9
16-20 miles	9	7.4	7	8.4	5	11.4	21	8.5
21 or more miles	5	3.7	2	2.5	6	13.6	13	5.2
No Answer	17	14.5	7	8.4	9	20.5	33	13.3
Total	121	100.0	83	100.0	44	100.0	248	100.0

TABLE 6

METHODS OF TRANSPORTATION USED BY RESPONDENTS

Mode of Transportation	Metropolitan		Western		District		Total	
	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct
Bus	46	24.4	3	3.5	21	31.3	70	20.6
Rapid	27	14.4	--	--	6	9.0	33	9.7
Auto	88	46.8	81	95.3	31	46.3	200	58.8
Walk	1	0.5	--	--	--	--	1	0.3
Combination	18	9.6	--	--	7	10.4	25	7.4
No Answer	8	4.3	1	1.2	2	3.0	11	3.2

TABLE 7

AVERAGE COMMUTING TIME OF RESPONDENTS

Mode of Transportation	Metropolitan	Western	District
Bus	49.2 minutes	65.0 minutes	54.0 minutes
Rapid	38.9 minutes	--	35.0 minutes
Car	35.9 minutes	20.2 minutes	35.8 minutes
Combination	45.0 minutes	--	52.1 minutes
All Respondents	40.5 minutes	21.8 minutes	44.5 minutes

TABLE 8

RESPONDENT'S CURRENTLY BUYING OR RENTING THEIR LIVING QUARTERS
AND THEIR EXPRESSED RENTAL OR PURCHASE PREFERENCE

Residence Status and Preference	Metropolitan		Western		District		Total	
	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct
Currently:								
Buy	68	56.2	54	65.1	24	54.5	146	58.9
Rent	52	43.0	29	34.9	19	43.2	100	40.3
No Answer	1	0.8	--	--	1	2.3	2	0.8
Total	121	100.0	83	100.0	44	100.0	248	100.0
Prefer:								
Buy	75	62.0	64	77.1	30	68.2	169	68.1
Rent	37	30.6	13	15.7	10	22.7	60	24.2
No Answer	9	7.4	6	7.2	4	9.1	19	7.7
Total	121	100.0	83	100.0	44	100.0	248	100.0

TABLE 9

TYPE OF DWELLING UNIT OCCUPIED AS COMPARED TO THE TYPE PREFERRED

	House				Duplex				Multiple Unit				No Answer				Total				Grand Total
	House	Duplex	Multiple Unit	No Answer	House	Duplex	Multiple Unit	No Answer	House	Duplex	Multiple Unit	No Answer	House	Duplex	Multiple Unit	No Answer	House	Duplex	Multiple Unit	No Answer	
Metro	61	--	3	12	1	3	1	1	16	1	17	1	--	--	--	4	78	4	21	18	121
Pct	50.4	--	2.5	9.9	0.8	2.5	0.8	0.8	13.3	0.8	14.1	0.8	--	--	--	3.3	64.4	3.3	17.4	14.9	100.0
Western	55	--	2	6	4	--	--	2	3	1	8	--	1	--	1	--	63	1	11	8	83
Pct	66.3	--	2.4	7.3	4.8	--	--	2.4	3.6	1.2	9.6	--	1.2	--	1.2	--	75.9	1.2	13.3	9.6	100.0
District	28	--	--	2	1	--	1	--	6	1	2	2	--	--	--	1	35	1	3	5	44
Pct	63.6	--	--	4.5	2.3	--	2.3	--	13.7	2.3	4.5	4.5	--	--	--	2.3	79.5	2.3	6.8	11.4	100.0
Total	144	--	5	20	6	3	2	3	25	3	27	3	1	--	1	5	176	6	35	31	248
Pct	58.1	--	2.0	8.1	2.4	1.2	.8	1.2	10.1	1.2	10.9	1.2	0.4	--	0.4	2.0	71.0	2.4	14.1	12.5	100.0

TABLE 10

ADULTS (OVER 18 YEARS OLD) RESIDING IN RESPONDENT'S DWELLINGS

Number	Metropolitan		Western		District		Total	
	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct
1-2	87	71.9	55	66.3	34	77.3	176	71.0
3 or more	12	9.9	20	24.1	7	15.9	39	15.7
No Answer	22	18.2	8	9.6	3	6.8	33	13.3
Total	121	100.0	83	100.0	44	100.0	248	100.0

TABLE 11

CHILDREN (UNDER 18 YEARS OLD) RESIDING IN RESPONDENT'S DWELLINGS

Number	Metropolitan		Western		District		Total	
	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct
0	40	33.1	22	26.5	19	43.2	81	32.7
1-2	34	28.1	33	39.8	14	31.8	81	32.7
3-4	20	16.5	12	14.5	7	15.9	39	15.7
5 or more	2	1.6	3	3.6	1	2.3	6	2.4
No Answer	25	20.7	13	15.6	3	6.8	41	16.5
Total	121	100.0	83	100.0	44	100.0	248	100.0

TABLE 12

RESPONDENT'S INDICATED REQUIREMENTS
FOR ADEQUATE DWELLING PLACE

	Metropolitan	Western	District	Total
1 Bedroom	19	8	8	35
2 Bedrooms	28	13	8	49
3 Bedrooms	41	38	16	95
4 Bedrooms	25	19	10	54
5 Bedrooms	4	2	2	8
Basement	80	59	32	171
Garage	107	72	43	222
1 Car Garage	35	13	14	62
2 Car Garage	58	56	22	136
Other Parking Facilities	3	1	4	8
Dining Room	78	57	34	169
Family Room	72	49	23	144
1 Bath	30	14	11	55
1½ Baths	51	40	19	110
2 Baths	32	16	11	59
More than 2 Baths	1	2	--	3
Study	8	5	--	13
Large Wooded Yard	4	3	--	7
Total	676	467	257	1400

Note: Columns add to sums greater than response totals since question required multiple answers.

TABLE 13

EXPRESSED ADEQUACY OF CUYAHOGA COMMUNITY COLLEGE EMPLOYEES CURRENT DWELLINGS

	Metropolitan			Western			District			Total			Grand Total
	Buy	Rent	No Answer	Buy	Rent	No Answer	Buy	Rent	No Answer	Buy	Rent	No Answer	
Yes	42	16	1	33	7	--	13	8	1	88	31	2	121
Per Cent	34.8	13.2	0.8	27.3	5.8	--	10.7	6.6	0.8	72.7	25.6	1.7	100.0
No	23	35	--	19	21	--	10	11	--	52	67	--	119
Per Cent	19.3	29.4	--	16.1	17.6	--	8.4	9.2	--	43.7	56.3	--	100.0
No Answer	3	1	--	2	1	--	1	--	--	6	2	--	8
Per Cent	37.5	12.5	--	25.0	12.5	--	12.5	--	--	75.0	25.0	--	100.0
Total	68	52	1	54	29	--	24	19	1	146	100	2	248
Per Cent	27.4	20.9	0.4	21.8	11.7	--	9.7	7.7	0.4	58.9	40.3	0.8	100.0

TABLE 14

MONTHLY MORTGAGE PAYMENTS BEING CARRIED BY
CUYAHOGA COMMUNITY COLLEGE EMPLOYEES

	Metropolitan		Western		District		Total	
	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct
Less than $75	--	--	1	1.9	--	--	1	0.7
76 - 100	4	5.9	3	5.6	1	4.2	8	5.5
100 - 125	11	16.2	9	16.7	5	20.8	25	17.1
126 - 150	14	20.6	7	12.9	3	12.5	24	16.5
151 - 175	9	13.2	9	16.7	6	25.0	24	16.5
176 - 200	7	10.3	7	12.9	3	12.5	17	11.6
201 - 225	4	5.9	2	3.7	--	--	6	4.1
226 - 250	2	2.9	2	3.7	1	4.2	5	3.4
251 - 275	1	1.5	--	--	--	--	1	0.7
276 and over	2	2.9	2	3.7	--	--	4	2.7
Own Home	8	11.8	5	9.3	1	4.2	14	9.6
No Answer	6	8.8	7	12.9	4	16.6	17	11.6
Total	68	100.0	54	100.0	24	100.0	146	100.0

TABLE 15

MONTHLY RENTAL CHARGES PAID BY
CUYAHOGA COMMUNITY COLLEGE EMPLOYEES

	Metropolitan		Western		District		Total	
	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct
Less than $75	3	5.8	--	--	1	5.3	4	4.0
76 - 100	13	25.0	5	17.2	8	42.1	26	26.0
101 - 125	11	21.2	6	20.7	2	10.5	19	19.0
126 - 150	10	19.2	8	27.6	5	26.3	23	23.0
151 - 175	6	11.5	2	6.9	--	--	8	8.0
176 or more	3	5.8	--	--	2	10.5	5	5.0
No Answer	6[a]	11.5	8[b]	27.6	1	5.3	15	15.0
Total	52	100.0	29	100.0	19	100.0	100	100.0

[a] Two are boarding with parents

[b] Seven are boarding with parents

TABLE 16

REPORTED SERVICES, UTILITIES, OR ITEMS
INCLUDED ON RENTAL PAYMENTS OF
CUYAHOGA COMMUNITY COLLEGE EMPLOYEES

	Metropolitan	Western	District	Total
Heat	34	11	10	55
Water	43	16	15	74
Electricity	6	4	5	15
Air Conditioning	14	7	4	25
Garbage Removal	33	15	9	57
Custodial and Gardening	30	7	10	47
Snow Removal	33	8	9	50
Carpeting	32	8	7	47
Drapes	8	4	2	14
Cloths Washer	20	5	7	32
Cloths Drier	21	4	7	32
Dish Washer	5	2	5	12
Garbage Disposal	18	6	6	30
Pool (Swimming)	2	--	--	2
Furniture	2[a]	1	--	3
Party or Recreation Room	1	--	--	1
None of the above	24	2	1	27
Total	326	100	97	523

[a]One at $90/month and the other at $125/month.

TABLE 17

RESPONDENT'S OPINIONS REGARDING THEIR
RENTAL PAYMENTS FAIRNESS OR REASONABLENESS

	Metropolitan		Western		District		Total	
	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct	Count	Pct
Lower	16	30.8	6	20.7	8	42.1	30	30.0
Equal	27	51.9	11	37.9	6	31.5	44	44.0
Higher	2	3.9	2	6.9	1	5.3	5	5.0
No Answer	7	13.4	10*	34.5	4	21.1	21	21.0
Total	52	100.0	29	100.0	19	100.0	100	100.0

* Includes Boarders

TABLE 18

EFFECT OF PLACES OF WORSHIP UPON WHERE
CUYAHOGA COMMUNITY COLLEGE EMPLOYEES CHOSE TO LOCATE

	Metropolitan			Western			District			Total			Grand Total
	Buy	Rent	No Answer	Buy	Rent	No Answer	Buy	Rent	No Answer	Buy	Rent	No Answer	
Greatly	4	4	1	6	1	--	4	2	--	14	7	1	22
Per Cent	18.2	18.2	4.5	27.3	4.5	--	18.2	9.1	--	63.7	31.8	4.5	100.0
Moderately	11	6	--	14	4	--	8	4	--	33	14	--	47
Per Cent	23.4	12.8	--	29.8	8.5	--	17.0	8.5	--	70.2	29.8	--	100.0
Very Little	14	7	--	12	6	--	1	3	--	27	16	--	43
Per Cent	32.6	16.3	--	27.9	14.0	--	2.3	6.9	--	62.8	37.2	--	100.0
Not at all	29	27	--	14	13	--	8	7	--	51	47	--	98
Per Cent	29.6	27.6	--	14.3	13.3	--	8.1	7.1	--	52.0	48.0	--	100.0
No Answer	10	8	--	8	5	--	3	3	1	21	16	1	38
Per Cent	26.3	21.1	--	21.1	13.1	--	7.9	7.9	2.6	55.3	42.1	2.6	100.0
Total	68	52	1	54	29	--	24	19	1	146	100	2	248
Per Cent	27.4	20.9	0.4	21.8	11.7	--	9.7	7.7	0.4	58.9	40.3	0.8	100.0

TABLE 19

INDICATED EFFECT OF SCHOOLS UPON WHERE CUYAHOGA COMMUNITY COLLEGE EMPLOYEES CHOSE TO LIVE

	Metropolitan			Western			District			Total			Grand Total
	Buy	Rent	No Answer	Buy	Rent	No Answer	Buy	Rent	No Answer	Buy	Rent	No Answer	
Greatly	33	10	--	27	6	--	13	3	--	73	19	--	92
Per Cent	35.9	10.9	--	29.3	6.5	--	14.1	3.3	--	79.3	20.7	--	100.0
Moderately	13	4	--	11	4	--	5	--	--	29	8	--	37
Per Cent	35.1	10.8	--	29.8	10.8	--	13.5	--	--	78.4	21.6	--	100.0
Very Little	2	1	--	5	--	--	3	--	--	10	1	--	11
Per Cent	18.2	9.1	--	45.5	--	--	27.2	--	--	90.9	9.1	--	100.0
Not at all	1	3	--	1	--	--	--	3	--	2	6	--	8
Per Cent	12.5	37.5	--	12.5	--	--	--	37.5	--	25.0	75.0	--	100.0
Not Applicable	14	31	1	9	16	--	3	13	1	26	60	2	88
Per Cent	15.9	35.2	1.1	10.3	18.2	--	3.4	14.8	1.1	29.6	68.2	2.2	100.0
No Answer	5	3	--	1	3	--	--	--	--	6	6	--	12
Per Cent	41.7	25.0	--	8.3	25.0	--	--	--	--	50.0	50.0	--	100.0
Total	68	52	1	54	29	--	24	19	1	146	100	2	248
Per Cent	27.4	20.9	0.4	21.8	11.7	--	9.7	7.7	0.4	58.9	40.3	0.8	100.0

TABLE 20

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION
"DO YOUR CHILDREN ATTEND PAROCHIAL (OR PRIVATE) SCHOOLS?"

	Metropolitan			Western			District			Total		
	Buy	Rent	No Answer	Buy	Rent	No Answer	Buy	Rent	No Answer	Buy	Rent	No Answer
"Yes"												
Elementary	1	1	--	4	--	--	4	1	--	9	2	--
Secondary	1	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	2	1	--
Special	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1	1	--
College	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--
Elementary & Secondary	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--
"Yes" & "No"												
Elementary & Secondary	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--
Elementary & Special	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--
"No"	34	10	1	29	5	--	13	3	--	76	18	1
Not Applicable	22	37	--	13	21	--	5	12	1	40	70	1
No Answer	3	2	2	5	2	--	2	3	--	10	7	2
Total	67	51	3	54	29	--	24	19	1	145	99	4

TABLE 21

RESPONDENT'S EXPRESSED "LIKES" ABOUT
THE GREATER CLEVELAND AREA

	Metropolitan	Western	District	Total
Generally a good place to live	32	21	9	62
Educational Opportunities	24	7	7	38
Employment Opportunities	29	3	5	37
Home and Family	19	9	7	35
Nothing	7	1	6	14
Shopping Facilities	2	6	4	12
Cultural Opportunities	--	7	3	10
The People	5	--	1	6
Metropolitan Parks	5	--	--	5
Privacy	--	1	--	1
Temporary Nature	--	--	1	1
Transportation	--	--	1	1
No Answer	22	35	8	65
Total	145	90	52	287

TABLE 22

WHAT RESPONDENTS DISLIKED ABOUT
THE GREATER CLEVELAND AREA

	Metropolitan	Western	District	Total
Traffic and Transportation	27	18	11	56
General Dislike	25	9	3	37
Pollution	20	8	9	37
Weather	19	13	3	35
Housing Costs	9	--	4	13
Racial Trouble	7	2	--	9
Cost of Living	3	4	--	7
No Dislikes	3	3	1	7
City Government	--	--	5	5
Lack of Entertainment	4	--	--	4
Dirty City and Unfriendly People	--	1	1	2
Small Townish	--	--	2	2
Changing Neighborhoods	--	--	1	1
No Opinion	--	--	1	1
No Answer	22	25	11	58
Total	139	83	52	274

APPENDIX II

Questionnaire Used to Collect Data

CUYAHOGA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

To: All College Faculty, Administrative and Nonacademic Personnel

January 15, 1968

From: Office of Planning and Development
C. Sidney Noble, Director of Special Assistance

Subject: HOUSING AND TRANSPORTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Colleague:

This questionnaire is part of an on-going series of studies to provide us with information for planning. Its content has been designed to develop a profile relating to transportation and housing of college faculty, administrative and nonacademic personnel.

Data derived from this study will have implications bearing upon such matters as recruitment of personnel; developing policies concerning the housing for faculty and staff; providing information for private developers of housing and related facilities; establishing a college housing office, etc.

Please check and/or supply information as it applies to you in each question and return the questionnaire to the Office of Planning and Development, College District Office, 2123 East 9th Street, Cleveland, Ohio, 44115 by February 15, 1968.

It is not intended that this be signed.

TRANSPORTATION

1. Where is your present assignment?
   - Metropolitan Campus ( )
   - Western Campus ( )
   - District Office ( )
2. How many miles do you live from where you work? _____
3. How long does it usually take you to commute by:
   - Bus _____
   - Rapid _____
   - Car _____
   - Combination of these _____

   If you drive, do you park in:
   - Public facilities ( )
   - College facilities ( )

HOUSING

4. Are you now:
   - Renting ( )
   - Buying ( )

   a. Which do you generally prefer?
   - Renting ( )
   - Buying ( )

5. Do you presently occupy:
   - House ( )
   - Duplex ( )
   - Multiple Unit ( )

   a. What type do you prefer? _____

6. Check what you consider requirements for adequate housing for you:

1 BR	( )
2 BR	( )
3 BR	( )
4 BR	( )
5 BR or more	( )
Basement	( )
Garage	( )
Single	( )
Double	( )
Other	( )
Dining Room	( )
Family Room	( )
1 Bathroom	( )
1½ Baths	( )
2 Bathrooms	( )
Other (describe)	_____

Does your present dwelling contain all the features you have checked as desirable?

Yes	( )
No	( )

7. If you are renting, what monthly rent do you pay? _____

a. Check what this rental includes:

Heat	( )
Water	( )
Electricity	( )
Air Conditioning	( )
Garbage Removal	( )
Custodial & Gardening	( )
Snow Removal	( )
Carpets	( )
Drapes	( )
Washer	( )
Dryer	( )
Dishwasher	( )
Garbage Disposal	( )
None of these	( )
Other	_____

b. State what you would consider a fair and reasonable monthly rent for your facilities? _____

8. If you are buying a home, what does your house payment, including taxes and interest, average per month? _____

9. How much did the consideration of what schools your children would attend influence your decision to live where you do?

Greatly	( )
Moderately	( )
Very little	( )
Not at all	( )
Not applicable	( )

10. Do your children attend parochial (or private) schools?

Yes	( )
No	( )

If yes, do they attend:

Elementary	( )
Secondary	( )
Special	( )

11. How much did the consideration of the location of a parish or place of worship influence your decision to live where you do?

Greatly	( )
Moderately	( )
Very little	( )
Not at all	( )

GENERAL

12. Are you:

Male	( )
Female	( )
Married	( )
Single	( )
Other	( )

13. Are you:

Faculty	( )
Administrative	( )
Nonacademic	( )

14. a. How many adults (over 18) are living at home? _____

b. How many children (under 18) are living at home? _____

15. What do you like most about living in the Greater Cleveland Area? _____

_____

_____

16. What do you like least about living in the Greater Cleveland Area? _____

_____

_____

17. We thank you:

Very much	(X)
Moderately	( )
Very little	( )
Not at all	( )

CSN:ch